

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.ospto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/890,028	07/24/2001	Kazuyuki Nakata	AD-6705	5970	
7:	590 07/23/2002				
Craig A Evans			EXAMINER		
E I du Pont de I Legal Patents	Nemours & Company		NILAND, PATRICK DENNIS		
Wilmington, DE 19898			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1714		
			DATE MAILED: 07/23/2002	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*	l-	Application No.	I Annies de la Company
		Application No.	Applicant(s)
	Office Action Summany	09/890,028	NAKATA, KAZUYUKI
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	The MAIL INC DATE of this communication on	Patrick D. Niland	1714
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap r Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
THE No Exter after If the If NO Failure Any re	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period e to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute to ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply oly within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH: e, cause the application to become ABAN	y be timely filed 10) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
լ. 1)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·	
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ T	his action is non-final.	
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allow	ance except for formal matter	rs, prosecution as to the merits is
Dispositi	closed in accordance with the practice under on of Claims	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.
	Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the applicatio	n.	·
	la) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra		
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.		
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.	
9)∐ T	he specification is objected to by the Examine	er.	
10) 🔲 T	he drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ acce	pted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.
3	Applicant may not request that any objection to th	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11) 🗌 T	he proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disa	pproved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in re	ply to this Office action.	
12) 🔲 T	he oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.	
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) 🛛 📝	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigi	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	19(a)-(d) or (f).
a)[∑]All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		
1	. \square Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.	
2	Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received in Appli	cation No
	Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bute the attached detailed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	· ·
	knowledgment is made of a claim for domesti		
_ a)	☐ The translation of the foreign language pro knowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	visional application has been	received.
Attachment(:			
2) Notice	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>3</u>	5) Notice of Inform	mary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) nal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Patent and Trac O-326 (Rev.		tion Summary	Part of Paper No. 4

Application/Control Number: 09/890028 Page 2

Art Unit: 1714

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1.12 are rejected and 2.5

2. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 2269822

Best in view of US Pat. No.5319019 Nothnagel.

Best discloses the instantly claimed dispersion except does not disclose the instantly claimed excess of ammonia nor the instantly claimed melt flow rate. See the entire document. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to use the instantly claimed melt flow rate because the polymer of Best would probably need to be within the instantly claimed broad melt flow rate range in order to form a film from a dispersion and to give the small particle size disclosed by Best. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to use the instantly claimed excess of ammonia because Nothnagel shows such excess ammonia to give more stable polyacrylate dispersions for the reasons stated at column 10, line 62 to column 11, line 7 and this stability would have been expected in the dispersion of Best for reasons which the ordinary skilled artisan would understand based on the teachings of Nothnagel, particularly the fact that ammonia is volatile and its removal will lead to polymer which does not have enough salt groups to keep it stably dispersed. This is well understood in the art today.

Application/Control Number: 09/890028 Page 3

Art Unit: 1714

3. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- A. A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claims 5-6 recite the broadly recited dispersion, and the claims also recite the narrower version of the dispersion with the narrowing feature denoted by "preferably".
- 4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick Niland whose telephone number is (703) 308-3510. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Art Unit: 1714

Vasu Jagannathan, can be reached on (703) 306-2777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-5408.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

pn

July 16, 2002

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1714